DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 117 TM 005 372

AUTHOR Fleming, Margaret
TITLE Title I and the Institutionalizing of Evaluation in an Urban School System.
PUB DATE [Apr 76]
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (60th, San Francisco, California, April 19-23, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education Programs; Educational Policy; *Evaluation Methods; *Federal Programs; *Program Evaluation; *School Districts; Staff Role; Surveys; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS Cleveland Public Schools; *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; Ohio (Cleveland)

ABSTRACT

It is proposed that the mandate for evaluation of Elementary Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I projects has served to establish models for evaluation design, implementation, and utilization of findings in a large urban school system. Contrary to the experience with evaluation of the "national" Title I program, local efforts were decidely successful. Case study and staff questionnaire data were utilized to describe levels of expectancies of administrators and teachers produced by exposure to and involvement in Title I evaluation activities. Staff satisfaction increased as they experienced use of evaluation feedback. From the vantage point of a decade of evaluation experience, it is clear that an unanticipated result in the school district has been the ligitimizing of a policy for evaluation. (Author/RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED126117

AERA Session
28.13

TITLE I AND THE INSTITUTIONALIZING OF EVALUATION IN AN URBAN SCHOOL SYSTEM

Margaret Fleming, Director
Division of Research and Development
CLEVELAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Cleveland, Ohio

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Paper presented at
American Educational Research Association
Annual Meeting, San Francisco
April, 1976

TM005 372

TITLE I AND THE INSTITUTIONALIZING OF EVALUATION IN AN URBAN SCHOOL SYSTEM

The focus of this paper is to describe the impact on evaluation activities in a large urban school system produced by the evaluation mandate of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for Title I programs. From the vantage point of a decade of such evaluation efforts for ESEA Title I, it is clear that an unanticipated result in the school district has been the legitimizing of a policy for evaluation. During this decade of evaluation experience, formulation of evaluation policies and implementation of evaluation activities occurred despite the constraints produced by the complexities of the district bureaucracy. That the impetus for determining program efforts could be sustained, although viewed by some district authority figures and practitioners as a necessary evil for qualifying for funds, represents a rare turn of events. It runs counter to the typical fate of evaluation in bureaucratic systems.

School district decision makers traditionally have not accorded evaluation findings an important role, if indeed any portion of a role, in the formulation of policy or programming. Little consideration has been given to the data needed to sustain program worth. Few demands have been presented for objective evidence of program effects. Researchers of innovation processes have contended that the administrator's tendency in the matter of implementing educational change more often than not has been to "fall back on bromides, rules of thumb and conceptualizations without a strong empirical base" (Miles, 1974).

There have been, however, formidable problems in maintaining evaluation activities. Caro (1971) asserts that freely available facts

might reduce the security of the bureaucrats who would view evaluative data about programs as a threat. The low prestige accorded to research in action settings, the implementation problems of research in action settings and disagreement about use of results have also contributed to the problem of maintaining evaluative research activities. From an extensive review of the literature on issues in evaluation of social programs, Caro (1971) identifies major problems that have placed administrators and evaluators at cross purposes. These include ineffective communication and collaboration between administrator and evaluator, vague definitions of roles, conflict between staff and management loyalties, burdensome data collection procedures, issues of administrator program commitment and evaluator program neutrality, loose dissemination of results and budget constraints.

In 1965, the mandate for evaluation of ESEA Title I programs was unprecedented. Since that time, dimensions of the failures and successes produced by the mandate have provided a major theme in the literature related to evaluation. Cohen (1970) in his analysis of the ESEA Title I evaluation provision noted that it lacked any "enabling mechanism" and that the responsibility for carrying it out was specifically delegated to state and local education authorities who operated the programs. This turn of events was, in his opinion, "equivalent to abandoning much hope of useful program evaluation." In addition, Cohen (1970) emphasized the political dimension of evaluation. The politics were critical because the use of information which was at least potentially relevant to decision-making was involved. Such efforts would result in allocation of resources--money, position, authority involved and the like. To the extent that this information was a basis or excuse for changing power

relationships within the institution, the evaluation, in Cohen's opinion, became a political activity.

In a thorough case study of ESEA Title I evaluation implementation, McLaughlin (1975) described the efforts as "a mixture of reform counterreform, demand and compromise" which were generally dissipated by the "constraints of a policy system and behavior of bureaucracies."

McLaughlin (1975) identified major obstacles to the effort:

> The history of Title I evaluation also suggests a number of implications about the conduct and use of evaluation in a multi-level government structure. These lessons raise both methodological and functional questions about the wisdom of continuing pursuit of scientific rationality, especially in the instance of broad-aim social action programs, such as Title I, which represent an institutionalized federal investment. The Title I experience has shown how resistant the educational policy system is to assessment of achievements and accomplishments, and also that a number of obstacles to this confirmatory style of reporting are inherent in the system itself...Specifically, data on the relative effectiveness of teaching strategies or allocation of resources will be difficult to gather not only because of the unsystematic and decentralized data-collection practices existing at the local level, but also because local programs have little interest in these data and are disinclined to collect them or furnish them.

In McLaughlin's view, the final crux of the problem in the Title I experience was that "anyone who looks to evaluation to take the politics out of decisionmaking is bound to be disappointed." McLaughlin (1975) contended: "Evaluation efforts based on expectations for reform by means of a social report, or better information on program accomplishment, certainly would find justification in theory. But in practice, they may turn out to be little more than empty ritual."

Observation of public school affairs in the ten years following passage of ESEA has prompted Halperin (1975) to identify various educational successes for Public Law 89-10. He attributed the beginning of the

educational accountability movement to ESEA Title I evaluation provisions. "In 1965," he noted, "any federal prescription for testing, for measuring educational outcomes, for requiring anything other than basic fiscal honesty, was certain to provide ammunition for ESEA's foes." Although ESEA evaluations got off to a slow start with wide program variations among States, no uniform reporting procedures, few comparable practices to assess, clearcut mandates for evaluation of educational programs have emerged. The most recent extension of ESEA (P.L. 93-380) in Halperin's opinion, showed that the Congress has embraced the concept of evaluation with its stipulation for development and publishing of standards for determination of effectiveness. This requirement, he contended, would "have been politically unthinkable a decade ago."

Although the literature generally has featured the failures of national evaluation efforts of Title I, rarely has it included accounts of local Title I evaluation efforts. Yet the mandate for Title I evaluation engendered a range of responses from local educational agencies. (Webster 1972). Some 300 school districts are currently operating research/evaluation units.[1] Certainly some momentum for this state of affairs can be attributed to the need to produce Title I evaluations.

Webster (1972) observed that the pressure for evaluation in the public schools, in the absence of an earnest interest in objective information, led to many research and evaluatio departments structured along project lines. In his opinion, such structuring had tneded to inhibit the establishment of a systematic data base and to discourage the adoption of a unified strategy for evaluation. In Cleveland, the responsibility for ESEA

1. Personal communication, Dr. Larry W. Barber, Vice President, School Evaluation and Program Development (Division H, American Educational Research Association.)

Title I evaluation fell to the Bureau of Educational Research. Since the early twenties, the Bureau was a service division within the Cleveland system. Traditionally, the Bureau provided information retrieval related to selected areas of administrative research as well as city-wide testing services. In this latter instance, the Bureau staff had constructed numerous types of tests and produced local norms for these instruments to gauge impact of various Cleveland curricula. A regular testing program for elementary schools had been implemented annually since the 1925-24 school year. Fleming, 1974) notes that under the direction of the then Division of Reference and Research, the original plan involved administration of initial and final tests in order to facilitate study of the semester's growth in achievement in the five academic subjects in which the tests were given. Such a testing arrangement correlated with the semi-annual promotion plan of the Cleveland system in effect at that time.

To meet the demands of evaluation services for ESEA Title I, the first task for the Bureau became the recruitment of a staff with competencies in evaluation. Development of the proposals--applications, narratives, budgets and the like, emerged as another priority for the Bureau's services. From the onset, the strategy for program development was the requirement that the design of the program be scheduled concurrently with the design of evaluation procedures. A major advantage of this procedure was readily apparent, a cohesive approach for programming and evaluation was developed--producing a more efficient use of the resources that became available.

Within two years of the mandate, the Bureau became the Division of Research and Development reflecting the new priorities for its services within the school system.

As a background for consideration of the information gathered about the patterns of evaluative services provided in the district, it is

well to consider the "track record" of Title I projects within the district. A total of 32 separate projects have been funded under Title I since 1965. Of the 11 projects, currently in operation, three or slightly more than nine percent originated during the first year of operation. The district's style for installation of new projects has generally been a one-at-a-time plan, except for 1967-1968 when four of the 11 currently operating projects were originated. The survival rate for the projects has been summarized in Figure 1.

As can be seen from Figure 1, the survival rate of Title I projects has been rather substantial in the district. Fourteen or almost 44 percent of the projects have survived through being transferred intact to other funding where they have continued to operate. The reasons for such transferral have been many. In most instances, transfers were made because other specialized funding sources became available which were directly intended to support these efforts. Sometimes, the target populations in these projects were more generalized than categorical as was required under Title I guidelines. Other reasons for transferral involved the type of services being provided under Title I. For example, staff development efforts were given little priority in the state regulations. The directives that Title I services should be targeted on the early years of the school experience and that the projects must involve direct service to children rather than efforts to train teachers came through loud and clear.

When taking into account the transfer policy of the projects, the survival rate of Title I projects in the district has been high. It is fair to say, however, that the administrative experience gained in operating the Title I projects was a factor in such decisions. In addition, information from the evaluations documented that the activities were serving children and teachers in perfectly legitimate ways although in conflict with Title I

FIGURE 1

SURVIVAL RATE

TITLE I PROJECTS

N = 32

		N	%
ALIVE AND WELL			
SINCE 1965-66	(3)		
1966-67	(1)		
1967-68	(4)		
1968-69	(1)		
1969-70	(1)		
1973-74	(1)		
TOTAL:		11	34.2%
TRANSFERRED INTACT TO OTHER FUNDING		14	43.8%
SOME ELEMENTS INCORPORATED UNDER OTHER FUNDING		3	9.3%
DEAD AND BURIED		4	12.5%

guidelines. Generally, the evaluations provided data not only about what the staff said it was doing, but what the other audiences said they were doing. Consideration of such a variety of perspectives helped to clarify what was happening and what should have been happening. It has been a local fetish from the onstart of evaluation activities to attempt to relate pupil outcomes to whether or not the treatment was delivered. Without this base, pronouncements about client change were meaningless. From such a cauldron of administrative experience and evaluation findings, a modus operandi has emerged. To the credit of the district, the art of project development and implementation has come a long way since 1965.

That there are some "better ways than others" has been demonstrated in the matter of implementing projects. For example, projects of some scope require shakedown periods. For a major project, this time can mean about three school years to implement and refine operations. During this shakedown period, communication of project intent to school and community is critical. Credibility is an issue here. Pupil selection processes, scheduling of services, and, of course, selection of the staff require careful attention during the installation stages. The staff must be committed and they will need time to learn their roles. These phenomena in the educational enterprise have been identified time and again in the various evaluations provided for Title I and other projects. Unfortunately, these issues seem to be rarely considered by legislators and bureaucrats. They are usually most disillusionded when instant improvements are not forthcoming and do not seem willing to deal with the realities of project implementation.

Another consideration in the background of the impact of the Title I mandate for evaluation in the school district is the experience

with the evaluation liaison teacher plan. This effort was an attempt to upgrade the competencies of classroom teachers in program evaluation at the local school level. It was undertaken by the Division of Research and Developement in 1971. This plan provided for assignment of an evaluation teacher at each school to serve as a resource for the school staff in assessment of its programs. The model was first implemented in connection with the summer school programming offered in Cleveland's Title I schools. Each school staff had responsibility for undertaking planning and developing a summer program. As a result, evaluation was also undertaken at the local school for the summer school program. Consultants from the Division of Research and Development provided assistance to the teachers via the phone or on site. The teachers were responsible for supportive services to the staff in the areas of development of instructional objectives, data collection, data analysis techniques and reporting procedures. The Division staff developed four training sessions for the teachers and any principals who wished to attend. An evaluation packet of practice and source materials was provided for each school.

The evaluation liaison teacher model proved workable--indicating that local school personnel can evaluate, that large-scale training programs in evaluation are feasible and that support through central staff consultation produced more effective programming (Fleming, 1972). This experience served to involve every Title I school in evaluation efforts and to demonstrate the practicality of such efforts.

To assess the impact of the ESEA Title I mandate upon the evaluation activities of the Division, two approaches were employed for this paper. First, a case study was designed to describe the evaluation activities of the Division observed at two points of time. Although

such a study has an ex post facto character, it attempted to document the requests for evaluation service and origin of such requests between two points in time. In particular the request rates for the two periods, the types of evaluative questions and the types of processes to be implemented were described. The case study was an attempt to observe regular behavior in the ordinary setting of the Division's services. The second approach was a survey of special project managers and curriculum supervisors.

Two general purposes provided the focus for the case study of the pattern of evaluation requests made of the Division of Research and Development serving the Cleveland Public Schools. These purposes included (1) describing the nature of the requests for evaluation and (2) comparing the incidence of change occurring in the requests between two comparison points of time.

To obtain data to compare the nature of the evaluation requests, a simple form with 12 categories of services was devised to classify the requests. The classifications were derived from the published functions for the evaluation section of the Division. A record of the requests for the various services was obtained from a monthly planner log maintained in the office of the Division Director. The requests were recorded with the intention of establishing two samples so that the overall pattern of the requests and request rates could be determined and compared. Only initial or new requests were recorded in an effort to identify developing trends and to distinguish such activities from maintenance efforts. All projects funded through Federal and State sources receive the evaluative services listed in the checklist as part of the on-going operation of the Division. The two points of time selected were the 1971-72 and 1974-75 school years. These years were selected because they represented stages

of the Division's development. In the first instance, the Division reported to the Deputy Superintendent of the district. In the latter case, the Division had been incorporated into the Department of Special Projects and Continuing Education.

The staff requesting evaluative services were classified into those in the Curriculum and Instruction Department and those in the various compensatory and special projects. It should be noted that these central staff personnel were operating under the general fund in the first instance and federal and/or state sources in the latter instance.

Figure 2 summarizes the percentages of requests for the various types of evaluative services from the central staff working in curriculum and instruction and those working in the various projects. For the first comparison period--63 new requests were received from C & I Staff. The requests for the second period numbered 78. Special project staff requests totalled 43 and 45 respectively.

Comparison of the percentages of these new requests for evaluation indicates the following:

1. The types of requests from C & I personnel reflect less change than the types observed from the SP staff.

2. Since the first observation time, C & I requests for consultation services have almost doubled. Other increases occurred in the requests for training sessions and for development and/or refinement of objectives.

3. New C & I requests for development of assessment designs were continuing at a comparable rate, representing slightly more than one out of five of the total requests at both comparison points.

4. The greatest decrease in C & I requests occurred in the area of critiquing data collection requests.

(This last trend may be attributable to a policy for conducting cooperative research studies which was adopted by the school system in 1972. These requests are now channeled directly to the Division.)

FIGURE 2

PERCENTAGE OF EVALUATIVE SERVICE REQUESTS BY VARIOUS STAFF 1971-1972 VS 1974-1975

SERVICE REQUESTED	CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION STAFF				SPECIAL PROJECT STAFF			
	N = 63		N = 78		N = 43		N = 45	
1. ADMINISTER INSTRUMENTATION	3	4.7	3	3.8	3	6.9	4	8.8
2. ANALYZE DATA, APPLY DATA PROCESSING, COMPUTER SERVICES AND THE LIKE	9	14.2	9	11.5			2	4.4
3. CONSULT WITH STAFF ON SELECTED EVALUATION QUESTIONS	11	17.4	25	32.1	18	41.8	17	37.7
4. CRITIQUE DATA COLLECTION REQUESTS	8	12.6	4	5.1	1	2.3		
5. CONSTRUCT INSTRUMENTATION (TESTS, SURVEYS, INTERVIEWS)	5	7.9	2	2.5	1	2.3		
6. DEVELOP ASSESSMENT DESIGN	14	22.2	16	20.5	1	2.3	2	4.4
7. DEVELOP AND/OR REFINE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	5	7.9	8	10.2	4	9.3	4	8.8
8. IDENTIFY AND SELECT INSTRUMENTATION AVAILABLE COMMERCIALLY FOR DESIGN	1	1.5						
9. INTERVIEW PERSONNEL AND/OR OBSERVE OPERATIONS	1	1.5	1	1.2	2	4.6	2	4.4
10. PRESENT TRAINING SESSIONS	2	3.2	5	6.4	4	9.3		
11. PRESENT/DISSEMINATE FINDINGS TO STAFF	2	3.2	3	3.8	5	11.6	4	5.1
12. PRESENT/DISSEMINATE FINDINGS TO COMMUNITY	2	3.2	2	2.5	4	9.3	9	20.0

5. SP staff requests for presentations of findings to community groups reflected the largest increase between the two comparison points.

6. Presentation of findings to community represented the second largest increase in SP staff requests.

7. Largest decrease appeared in SP staff requests for presentation of training sessions. Consultation requests accounting for almost four out of ten, exceeded all other categories in the second period.

The changes in patterns of requests from the SP staff offer an interesting contrast to those observed for C & I personnel. Evaluation activities provided by the Division generally have emerged as a result of the requirements of the funding source. The shifts in the nature of the requests, therefore, appear to be related to the mandated procedures of the funding source. For example, more formalized dissemination of findings about the projects is now required for the community. Although many projects have operated for a number of years, project guidelines have increasingly mandated more specificity in program objectives which is reflected in a continuing level of activities in this area in the second comparison period. An increase also occurred in the area of analyzing data and applying data processing services. This demand apparently, is related to the increased availability of such services because of the school district's expansion of its computer services.

The steady rate of requests from the Special Project Staff indicates the continuing re-cycle of activities in the projects in question. The continuing and increasing pace of demand for evaluation services from the C & I staff reflects a ripple effect from the school district's efforts to provide for the evaluation of Title I and other federal and state funded projects in an appropriate manner.

Three purposes gave direction to the survey of Curriculum and

Instruction staff and Special Project managers. These were (1) to identify the general level of satisfaction with evaluation services being provided by the Division of Research and Development, (2) to describe the nature of the evaluation services which C & I staff reported receiving and (3) to determine the changes in such services which C & I staff and project managers might recommend.

Surveys were distributed through the school mail system to 28 C & I central staff and 48 SP managers. A response rate of 57 and 60 per cent respectively was achieved. The survey forms with percentages of response for the various categories may be found in Appendix A.

Almost nine out of ten C & I staff responding, indicated that they had requested assistance from the Division of Research and Development in 11 areas during the past three school years. Specifically, the following responses reflect the pattern of services provided. Over 80 percent reported assistance in writing project program proposals while less than 20 per cent reported help in designing instrumentation and compiling information. About forty-four percent reported help in conducting a program evaluation and almost four out of ten C & I respondents indicated assistance in writing behavioral objectives, conducting staff development programs and researching particular topics or questions.

A high level of satisfaction was reported with about nine out of ten indicating a rating of at least "well satisfied." Respondents commented on the practical, efficient service provided by responsive persons. Only one respondent indicated that inexperienced personnel had been assigned without sufficient training and guidance from the Division. More than half of the respondents indicated that they would definitely request program evaluation service again from the Division.

Three out of four C & I staff reported having received copies of various special project evaluations and expressed positive reactions to these reports. More than two out of three of the C & I staff indicated that they saw these evaluation reports as models for evaluation of programs in their curriculum area. Analysis of the content of their comments indicates that they view the purpose of evaluation as providing information about whether or not programs are meeting their objectives so that decisions could be made to improve the program. In addition, they appeared to view evaluation as identifying strengths and weaknesses of programs so that changes could be effected in the instruction services for pupils.

Three out of the seven recommendations received from C & I staff centered on the topic of personnel. Two called for expansion of the staff and the third, for assigning one person on a continuing basis so as to provide for continuity of philosophy and program awareness. One respondent noted a concern that testing instruments should reflect the program objectives being evaluated.

The survey data indicate that the C & I staff are knowledgeable about the evaluation services available and express a high level of satisfaction with the evaluation services that have been provided. Their view of the purposes of evaluation follows the general rationale promulgated for compensatory program evaluation. At this point in time they see the possibility of important information being generated for decision-making. This attitude appears to be substantiated as well by the increasing level of special requests noted in the Division log.

Definite contrasts in attitude could be predicted between the C & I staff and SP staff. In the latter case, a more negative view could be anticipated because evaluation for the projects is mandated by funding

sources. Viewed as a "necessary evil" and a process for which the staff would have no choice, negativism would be the case more often than not. Contrary to this expectation, almost three out of four SP staff reported being at least "well satisfied" with the services of the Division in evaluating their projects. Many more concerns than those expressed by the C & I staff were reported by SP personnel, however.

Apparently experience with evaluation contributes to greater support for the activity. About one out of four SP staff responded that their initial level of satisfaction improved over the years as a result of becoming more familiar with evaluation procedures, experiencing the use of evaluation feedback, seeing an improvement in the quality of the reports and finding a more cooperative working relationship with a change in evaluators. More than one third responding saw the project staff as also growing more favorable over the more recent years toward the evaluative process. Factors contributing to the resistance or negative reactions of the project staff to evaluation were identified as "too many data collection procedures, inherent suspicion of evaluation, poor communication about what was expected, tight schedule for data collection, lateness of availability of results and the project staff's difficulty in distinguishing between project evaluation and individual evaluation."

Almost 97 per cent of the SP staff reported using evaluation findings in discussing the project in staff conferences and meetings. In addition, findings were also discussed in meetings of the Parents' Advisory Councils, Parent Teacher Association, district administrators, state and federal officials and local, state and national meetings and during parental visitations. Only one respondent indicated not using the findings in any of these situations.

Satisfaction with some 17 aspects of the projects described in the project evaluations showed a range from a low of 14 per cent for the presentation of community opinion in the evaluation reports to a high of 79 per cent for presentation of the evaluation plan and data analysis. Other areas of apparent satisfaction included presentations of instructional procedures, pupil selection and staff responsibilities. Relatively less satisfaction was indicated for presentation of cost effectiveness data and affective effects in the evaluations.

Overall reaction to the evaluations provided for their projects saw about a two out of three ratio of respondents selecting responses indicated as "enthusiastic, useful, effective, promising, relevant, clear, interesting and positive" on the rating scale.

Analysis of comments of SP staff related to providing information for decision making about their projects show that timeliness of the information is viewed as determining its utility. Most view the data as a basis for adjusting plans and reorganizing operations. One respondent distinguished between decision making for project operations and decision making concerning the evaluation.

The primary purpose of evaluation of the projects was viewed as identification of strengths and weaknesses to determine whether or not the project is meeting its objectives. Generally, recommendations to the Division about evaluation operations involved assignment of evaluation personnel who are responsive and interact with the project staff, providing expanded feedback in enough time to use such information for improvement, improved presentation of data, simplification of data collection and improved communication about expectations and responsibilities.

Apparently, the assigning of persons as evaluators who are able

to establish appropriate rapport and communication is of critical importance in the design and carrying out of an evaluation. Particularly revealing is the following comment from a project manager:

> It is no secret...that Mrs. X has been of immeasurable support to us, since the beginning, by:
>
> . interpreting project responsibilities to Title I
> . accommodating, whenever possible, the special needs of the project
> . being available and willing to attend meetings of the entire staff whenever invited
> . showing enthusiasm for our work and making every effort to present it in a positive manner
> . being available for consultation at work, as well as at home
> . arranging her work so that we know deadlines and data required far in advance.
>
> We are very fortunate in having someone of Mrs. X's backgroung and experience in the field of reading as our evaluator.

In their perceptive analysis of Title I failures and successes, Hughes and Hughes (1972) described qualities of the district's Title I program. They identified its key features as centralized planning, deficit prevention, continuity of service, focus on achieving of grade level academic performance in relation to age and beaming of the entire program at disadvantaged children from hard core poverty. Although quoting extensively from evaluation data to show that improvement in pupil behavior can be achieved if the prescribed treatments are delivered, they take no note of the fact that a concerted and formalized evaluation process had provided their information.

It is evident from the incidence of requests for evaluation services from C & I staff and the perceptions of SP staff that evaluation has been legitimized in the district. Although problems continue in various areas such as providing timely feedback of information, maintaining communication about intent of evaluation and careful monitoring

of process to determine implementation, it is apparent that evaluation can be a credible process. The mandate for Title I evaluation has served to structure not only expectancies for evaluation of Title I projects but for other district endeavors as well. Hopefully, the evaluation effort has demonstrated the utility of evaluation services for program improvement. The moral of the story seems to be that utility will soon be discovered. The word appears to get around very fast when such services live up to their promise.

APPENDIX A

. CCI Staff

. Project Staff

APPENDIX A

Summary of Responses

N = 16

1. During the past three school years, have you requested assistance from the Division of Research and Development?

	N	%		N	%		N	%
							No.	R
Yes	14	87.5	No	1	6.3		1	6.3

If no, please skip to question four.

a. If yes, please indicate in which of the areas listed below assistance was requested. (Please check item.)

N	%		
6	37.5	(1)	writing behavioral objectives
4	25.	(2)	constructing classroom tests
4	25.	(3)	selecting standardized tests
13	81.3	(4)	writing project proposals
7	43.8	(5)	conducting a program evaluation
3	18.8	(6)	designing questionnaires, surveys and interview schedules
3	18.8	(7)	compiling information from school records, personnel or sources
6	37.5	(8)	conducting staff development programs
6	37.5	(9)	researching particular topic or question
3	18.8	(10)	other: critiquing materials; preparing reports

2. In general, how well satisfied were you with the services of the Division in the areas for which you had assistance? Place check below.

Very Well Satisfied		Well Satisfied		Somewhat Satisfied		Not Satisfied		Not at all Satisfied		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%					N	%
12	75	2	12.5	1	63					1	63

Comments: _____

_____

_____

3. If the Division has conducted a program evaluation for you, would you request such service again? Place a check in the blank below.

Definitely Yes N	%	Probably Yes	Undecided	Probably No	Definitely No	No Response N	%
9	56.3					7	43.7

4. Have you received copies of evaluation reports prepared by this Division of the following programs?

	N	%		N	%	No. R	
Yes	12	75.	No	3	18.8	1	6.3

If yes (Please check any in the list below which you have received.)

If no, please skip to question eight.

N	%		
8	50.0	Title I programs	(For example: Child Development, Math Skills, Reading Improvement)and the like)
7	43.8	Title III programs	(Environmental Action, Project Impact)and the like)
1	6.3	Title VI programs	(Handicapped Children programs)
2	12.5	Title VII programs	(Bilingual program)
4	25.0	Title IX programs	(Ethnic Studies program)

5. Please list any other evaluation reports from this Division which you have received.

_____

_____

_____

6. How would you describe your reactions to these evaluations or others from the Division which you have had a chance to read. Place a check in the blank which is closest to the way you feel.

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		No Basis for answer
positive	9	51.3	3	18.7							negative	
indifferent			1	6.3	1	6.3	3	18.7	3	18.7	enthusiastic	
supportive	9	56.3	2	12.5							opposed	
useful	9	56.3	3	18.8							useless	
discouraging					1	6.3	5	31.3	4	25.0	promising	
irrelevant							3	18.7	8	50.0	relevant	
clear	7	43.8	4	25.0	1	6.3					confusing	
effective	6	37.5	6	37.5							ineffective	
interesting	7	43.8	3	18.7	2	12.5					dull	

7. Do you feel that any of these reports offer models for evaluation of programs in your curriculum area?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

8. What do you consider to be the primary purpose of evaluation of school and/or subject area programs?

_____

_____

_____

9. What changes would you recommend that this Division implement in its evaluation operations?

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX A

Summary of Responses

N = 29

1. In your years as a project manager, the Division of Research has provided evaluation service to your project. In general, how well satisfied were you initially with the services of the Division in evaluating your project. Place a check in the blank below.

Very Well Satisfied		Well Satisfied		Somewhat Satisfied		Little Satisfied		Not at all Satisfied		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
12	41.3	9	31.0	3	10.3	3	10.3	1	3.4	1	3.4

2. How has your opinion changed since then?

Much more Positive Now		More Positive Now		No Change		Less Positive Now		Much less Positive Now		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			N	%
5	17.2	4	13.7	18	62.0	1	3.4			1	3.4

3. If your initial opinion has changed, why? Yes 7 24.1% No 22 75.9%

. more familiar with evaluation procedures and program

. feedback from Division has arrived early enough to you in planning

2 . change of evaluator who proved more knowledgeable, showed more concern for project success and made more services available to us

. improved quality of reports and continuing service

2 . more cooperative planning and evaluators became more knowledgeable about program and difficulties encountered.

4. How would you describe the initial reactions to the evaluation of the groups listed below? (Place a check in the blank which is closest to the way you feel.)

	No Response		Favorable		Somewhat Favorable		Neutral		Somewhat Opposed		Strongly Opposed	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Project staff	1	3.4	14	48.3	8	27.5	2	6.8	3	10.3	1	3.4
Other teachers in project schools	4	13.7	5	17.2	8	31.0	8	27.5	3	10.3		
Principals in project schools	4	13.7	6	20.7	7	24.1	10	34.4	1	3.4		
Parents	10	34.4	5	17.2	6	20.6	7	24.1				
Administration	9	31.0	5	17.2	9	31.0	5	17.2				
PAC/Community Councils	14	48.2	5	17.2	2	6.8	6	20.6	1	3.4		

5. Have these reactions changed over the past few years? Use the following scale by placing a check in the appropriate blank below:

	Grown more Favorable		No Change		Grown Less Favorable		No Basis for answer		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Project staff	10	34.5	14	48.2	2	6.8	2	6.9	1	3.4
Other teachers in project schools	8	27.5	14	48.2			2	6.8	5	17.2
Principals in project schools	5	17.2	17	58.6			2	6.8	4	13.7
Parents	3	10.3	11	37.9			3	10.3	11	37.9
Administration	5	17.2	11	37.9			3	10.3	9	31.0
PAC/Community Councils	4	13.8	7	24.1			4	13.8	13	44.8

6. Which of the following factors probably contributed to any resistance or negative reaction to the project evaluation from the staff? Please check below.

No Response			
24	82.8	5	17.2 Previous experience with evaluation procedures
25	86.2	4	13.7 Poor communication; people were not informed about what was expected
21	72.4	8	27.5 Presence of too many data collection procedures
26	89.5	3	10.3 Schedule of data collection
22	75.8	7	24.1 Other (specify) 2 . inherent suspicion of evaluation . poor testing situation set up by evaluator . lack of understanding about necessity for program evaluation . lateness of availability of results
22	75.8	7	24.1 No resistance was encountered
			___ Don't know

. teachers find it hard to distinguish between project evaluation and individual evaluation
. staff was on defensive because of having been scolded about school standings

7. Please indicate by a check if you have used any of the evaluation findings in discussing the project in (Process Evaluation)

28	96.5	Staff conferences, meetings
13	44.8	PAC meetings
9	31.0	PTA meetings
11	37.9	Parental visitations to the project classes, services
16	55.1	Other (SPECIFY) . administrative personnel . community . State meetings, SEA communications council . demonstration meetings . Federal officials . salesmen trying to sell wares . agencies . inservice meetings, workshops . home visitations . national meetings
1	3.4	Not used

8. How well is each of the following aspects of your project described in the evaluations of your project? Place a check in the blank which is closest to the way you feel.

	Very Well		Fairly Well		Not at all		No Basis for answer		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
affective effects	4	13.7	6	20.6	13	44.8	1	3.4	1	3.4	4	13.7
cognitive effects	12	41.3	7	24.1	6	20.6					2	6.8	2	6.8
staff opinion	11	37.9	6	20.6	6	20.6	1	3.4	3	10.3			2	6.8
parental opinion	7	24.1	1	3.4	7	24.1	2	6.8	5	17.2	2	6.8	5	17.2
community opinion	4	13.7			4	13.7	4	13.7	6	20.6	5	17.2	6	20.6
cost effectiveness	6	20.6	5	17.2	3	10.3	2	6.8	3	10.3	3	10.3	7	24.1
staff development activities	9	31.0	10	34.4	3	10.3	3	10.3	2	6.8			2	6.8
instructional procedures	13	44.8	7	24.1	3	10.3	2	6.8			1	3.4	3	10.3
project timetable	8	27.5	5	17.2	3	10.3	1	3.4	2	6.8	4	13.7	6	20.6
dissemination activities	8	27.5	6	20.6	3	10.3	2	6.8	4	13.7	2	6.8	4	13.7
pupil selection	14	48.3	5	17.2	1	3.4	3	10.3	1	3.4	3	10.3	2	6.8
evaluation plan	18	62.0	5	17.2	3	10.3	1	3.4					2	6.8
data analysis	16	55.1	7	24.1	2	6.8					1	3.4	3	10.3
staff responsibilities	13	44.8	6	20.6	5	17.2	1	3.4	1	3.4			3	10.3
project materials	9	31.0	9	31.0	5	17.2	1	3.4	2	6.8			3	10.3
project organization and management	15	51.7	4	13.7	5	17.2	2	6.8	1	3.4			2	6.8
instructional techniques	7	24.1	6	20.6	6	20.6	1	3.4	5	17.2	1	3.4	3	10.3

9. How would you describe your overall reaction to the evaluations provided for your project? Place a check in the blank which is closest to the way you feel.

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		No Response N	No Response %
indifferent	1	3.4			5	17.2	9	31.0	10	34.4	enthusiastic	4	13.7
useful	15	51.7	9	31.0	2	6.8	1	3.4	1	3.4	useless	1	3.4
effective	12	41.3	8	27.5	2	6.8	1	3.4	2	6.8	ineffective	4	13.7
discouraging	1	3.4	1	3.4	6	20.6	6	20.6	12	41.3	promising	3	10.3
irrelevant			2	6.8	5	17.2	6	20.6	13	44.8	relevant	3	10.3
clear	13	44.8	7	17.2	4	13.7	4	13.7			confusing	1	3.4
interesting	10	34.4	10	34.0	4	13.7	3	10.3			dull	2	6.8
negative	1	3.4	1	3.4	4	13.7	8	27.5	13	44.8	positive	2	6.8

10. Have you found that the evaluations supply you with information for decision making about your project?

Yes _____ No_____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

11. What do you consider to be the primary purpose of evaluation of projects?

_____

_____

_____

12. What changes would you recommend that this Division implement in its evaluation operations?

_____

_____

_____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Caro, Frances G., Issues in the Evaluation of Social Programs. Review of Educational Research 41, No. 2; April 1971, pp. 87-114.

Cohen, David K., Politics and Research: Evaluation of Social Action Programs in Education. Review of Educational Research 40, No. 2; April 1970, pp. 213-238.

Fleming, Margaret, Model for Upgrading Program Evaluation at the Local School Level. Cleveland Public Schools, Division of Research and Development, 1972.

Fleming, Margaret, et al; Test Review Committee, Cleveland Public Schools, Division of Research and Development, 1974.

Halperin, Samuel, ESEA Ten Years Later. Washington, D. C.: Educational Researcher, September 1975.

Hughes, John F. and Anne O. Hughes. Equal Education. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1972.

McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin, Evaluation and Reform. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1975.

Miles, Mathew, A Matter of Linkage: How Can Innovation Research and Innovation Practice Influence Each Other. In Sanford Temkin and Mary V. Brown (ed.) What Do Research Findings Say About Getting Innovations Into Schools: A Symposium. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, 1974. (Mimeographed.)